



UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
Patent and Trademark Office

Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS
Washington, D.C. 20231

SERIAL NUMBER	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.
---------------	-------------	----------------------	---------------------

08/220,851 03/31/94 MOTTIER

B2M1/0723

JONATHAN P. MEYER
MOTOROLA, INC.
INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY DEPARTMENT
600 NORTH U.S. HWY 45
LIBERTYVILLE, ILLINOIS 60048

M CE00497RD01
EXAMINER
ZIMMERMAN, B

ART UNIT PAPER NUMBER

14

2211
DATE MAILED:

07/23/96

This is a communication from the examiner in charge of your application.
COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS

☒ This application has been examined ☒ Responsive to communication filed on 3/27/96 ☐ This action is made final.

A shortened statutory period for response to this action is set to expire 3 month(s), _____ days from the date of this letter.
Failure to respond within the period for response will cause the application to become abandoned. 35 U.S.C. 133

Part I THE FOLLOWING ATTACHMENT(S) ARE PART OF THIS ACTION:

- ☐ Notice of References Cited by Examiner, PTO-892.
- ☐ Notice of Draftsman's Patent Drawing Review, PTO-948.
- ☐ Notice of Art Cited by Applicant, PTO-1449.
- ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application, PTO-152.
- ☐ Information on How to Effect Drawing Changes, PTO-1474.
- ☐

Part II SUMMARY OF ACTION

- ☒ Claims 19-24, 26-31, 33-38 are pending in the application.
Of the above, claims _____ are withdrawn from consideration.
- ☒ Claims 1-18, 25, 32, 39 have been cancelled.
- ☐ Claims _____ are allowed.
- ☒ Claims 19-24, 26-31, 33-38 are rejected.
- ☐ Claims _____ are objected to.
- ☐ Claims _____ are subject to restriction or election requirement.
- ☐ This application has been filed with informal drawings under 37 C.F.R. 1.85 which are acceptable for examination purposes.
- ☐ Formal drawings are required in response to this Office action.
- ☐ The corrected or substitute drawings have been received on _____. Under 37 C.F.R. 1.84 these drawings are ☐ acceptable; ☐ not acceptable (see explanation or Notice of Draftsman's Patent Drawing Review, PTO-948).
- ☐ The proposed additional or substitute sheet(s) of drawings, filed on _____, has (have) been ☐ approved by the examiner; ☐ disapproved by the examiner (see explanation).
- ☐ The proposed drawing correction, filed _____, has been ☐ approved; ☐ disapproved (see explanation).
- ☐ Acknowledgement is made of the claim for priority under 35 U.S.C. 119. The certified copy has ☐ been received ☐ not been received ☐ been filed in parent application, serial no. _____; filed on _____.
- ☐ Since this application appears to be in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under Ex parte Quayle, 1935 C.D. 11; 453 O.G. 213.
- ☐ Other

EXAMINER'S ACTION

EXAMINER'S RESPONSE

Status of Application.

1. In response to the applicant's amendment received on 3/27/96. The examiner has considered the new presentation of claims and applicant arguments in view of the disclosure and the present state of the prior art. And it is the examiner's position that claims 19-24,26-31,33-38 are unpatentable for the reasons set forth in this office action:

CLAIMS

2. The following is a quotation of the first paragraph of 35 U.S.C. § 112:

The specification shall contain a written description of the invention, and of the manner and process of making and using it, in such full, clear, concise, and exact terms as to enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and use the same and shall set forth the best mode contemplated by the inventor of carrying out his invention.

The specification is objected to under 35 U.S.C. § 112, first paragraph, as the specification, as originally filed, does not provide support for the invention as now claimed.

Specifically, the claimed definition of a cycle as comprising "a first period when the alert is generated followed by a second period when the alert is not generated," is not support by the specification as originally filed.

3. Claims 19-24,26-31,33-38 rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, first paragraph, for

the reasons set forth in the objection to the specification.

DOUBLE PATENTING

4. Claims 19,26,33 are provisionally rejected under the judicially created doctrine of non-obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 1,18,19,20 of U.S. application No. 220949 and claims 19,24,29,34 of U.S. application No. 220856.

The non-obviousness-type double patenting rejection is a judicially established doctrine based upon public policy and is primarily intended to prevent prolongation of the patent term by prohibiting claims in a second patent not patentably distinct from claims in a first patent. *In re Schneller*, 397 f.2d 350,158 USPQ 210(CCPA 1968). A timely filed terminal disclaimer in compliance with 37 C.F.R. § 1.321(b) would overcome an actual or provisional rejection on this ground provided the conflicting application or patent is shown to be commonly owned with this application. See 37 C.F.R. § 1.78(d).

A two part test is applied to the claims. 1) is the subject matter recited in the claims of the application fully disclosed in the patent and covered by a claim in the patent. If yes, the second test is 2) is there any reason why applicant was prevented from presenting the same claims for examination in the issued patent (application) if the answer is no a double patenting rejection is appropriate.

Here, the subject matter recited in the pending claim is fully disclosed in the

applications referred above and covers the same subject matter covered by claims 1,18,19,20 of U.S. application No. 220949 and claims 19,24,29,34 of U.S. application No. 220856. Further, there was no reason why applicant was prevented from presenting the same claim for examination in the other application. The applicant has not maintained a clear line of demarkation between the above applications. Furthermore, the applicant appears to intend the above applications referring to the same subject matter since all have the same title.

5. Claims 21-25,28-32,35-39 are provisionally rejected under the judicially created doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 1,18,19,20 of U.S. application No. 220949 and claims 19,24,29,34 of application No. 220856 in view of Breeden as discussed above.

6. The obviousness-type double patenting rejection is a judicially established doctrine based upon public policy and is primarily intended to prevent prolongation of the patent term by prohibiting claims in a second patent not patentably distinct from claims in a first patent. *In re Vogel*, 164 USPQ 619 (CCPA 1970). A timely filed terminal disclaimer in compliance with 37 C.F.R. § 1.321(b) would overcome an actual or provisional rejection on this ground provided the conflicting application or patent is shown to be commonly owned with this application. See 37 C.F.R. § 1.78(d).

REMARKS

Response to Arguments.

Applicant's arguments with respect to claim 19-24,26-31,33-38 have been

08/220851
2211

5

considered but are deemed to be moot in view of the new grounds of rejection.

CONTACT INFORMATION

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Brian Zimmerman whose telephone number is (703) 305-4796.

5

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application should be directed to the Group receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 305-4900.

**Brian Zimmerman
Patent Examiner
Art Unit 2211**



10

**baz
703-305-4796**